

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

RECEIVED
USDC, CLERK, CHARLESTON, SC

2010 MAY 13 P 2:11


Robert Carl Moore, Jr.,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
CO Mr. Ramsey, CO Mr. Warrior,)
and Miss Hollis,)
)
Defendants.)
_____)

Civil Action No. 8:09-1770-SB

ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon the pro se Plaintiff's complaint, which was filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. By local rule, the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations.


On April 14, 2010, United States Magistrate Judge Bruce Howe Hendricks issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") analyzing the Plaintiff's complaint and recommending that the Court grant the Defendants' motion to dismiss. Attached to the R&R was a notice advising the Plaintiff of the right to file specific, written objections to the R&R within 14 days of the date of service of the R&R. To date, no objections have been filed.

 Absent timely objection from a dissatisfied party, a district court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, a Magistrate Judge's factual or legal conclusions. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997). Here, because the Plaintiff did not file any specific, written objections, there are no portions of the R&R to which the Court must conduct a de novo review. Accordingly, after review, the Court hereby adopts the Magistrate Judge's R&R

(Entry 30) as the Order of this Court, and it is

ORDERED that the Defendants' motion to dismiss (Entry 23) is granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


The Honorable Sol Blatt, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

May 12, 2010
Charleston, South Carolina

